

in our Armed Forces had the strong support of the Congress of the United States? Or, will the record show that the Congress chose to leave them unprepared for the difficult trials asked of them? Common sense says that a secure and prosperous America can afford adequate, fully trained, properly equipped, and highly prepared military forces.

HISTORIC CHANGE IN THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this morning I rise to talk about what I feel is a historic change in the Congress of the United States.

When I was running for Congress last year and I received the Contract With America in the mail, I was very, very pleasantly surprised, because when I read through the contract I felt like I was reading my own campaign platform. For months I had been campaigning on how we need to reform the Congress itself and how the Congress does business, how we needed to shrink the size of Government, and how we needed to start in the Congress itself by reducing the number of committees and the number of committee staff.

One of the most important things that I ran on was how strongly I felt that the Congress needed to make all of the laws that they exempted themselves from apply to themselves. Indeed, I was very impressed when I read in the Federalist papers No. 37 written by Madison, how he described in that paper how the Congress should not be allowed to pass laws that did not apply to themselves and their friends.

Mr. Speaker, I am so delighted to actually be here and to see us fulfilling our commitment to the American people, how on that historic day on January 4 we passed all of those congressional reforms reducing the staff, reducing the number of committees, and then how we went on to pass legislation making all of the laws the Congress had exempted themselves from applying to the Congress itself.

Then in recent weeks we have seen historic vote after vote, the passage of a balanced budget amendment, the passage of legislation stopping the practice of passing unfunded mandates on to our cities and on to our counties. I heard over and over again in my campaign from local legislators, local politicians how the burden of unfunded mandates and regulations was killing them.

Then last night again we had another historic vote where a Republican Congress, with a sitting Democrat President, voted to give the President line-item veto authority. It was doubly ironic, it was sweet that this occurred on the birthday of President Ronald Reagan, a man who had campaigned

over and over again for the need for a line-item veto for our President. He stated over and over again how there were dozens of Governors in our Nation, in our States who have line-item veto authority, and how they exercise that line-item veto authority prudently to pare back pork-barrel spending and to trim State deficits and help State governments to be more efficient.

Last night we had a historic bipartisan vote where we passed a line-item veto.

Mr. Speaker, we have many, many more important votes coming before this body, votes on some real criminal justice reform to lock up violent offenders, some real welfare reform. Mr. Speaker, I am excited and delighted to be here and be part of this historic Congress, restoring to the American people, their body, faith in Government again.

□ 0950

MINIMUM WAGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON of Indiana). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HILLIARD] is recognized during morning business for 2 minutes.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of increasing the minimum wage. Lately I have heard a lot of rhetoric which is both misleading and dead wrong.

Just this Sunday I heard it stated that the only people who work minimum wage jobs are high school and college age kids. Mr. Speaker, this may be true in the wealthier suburban areas of this country, but I wish to tell you that in Appalachia or in the Mississippi Delta or in the Black belt of Alabama or in Watts, in Harlem, this is just not the case, and I wish to inform all of those persons who are misinformed that these are jobs that people work to live, and they are not living the American dream. They are having difficulties just living. They are having difficulties in many ways trying to find a decent place to live, because of the low wages that they receive. These are not people who are on welfare, but these are Americans. They are those who reject welfare. They are those who try to live within the system.

Yes, they have a hard time living the American dream, but these are good Americans. They work minimum wage jobs in many instances, because there are no other jobs available in the communities where they live. These are hard-working Americans.

Some of them have high school diplomas, and some who even went to college; many of them are too proud to take welfare, so they are stuck in these low-paying jobs.

Mr. Speaker, we talk a lot about welfare reform, and getting many of our citizens off of welfare. I believe we owe it to these working Americans, these young adults who work minimum wage

jobs, the working mothers and fathers, the seniors trying to make ends meet. Yes, we owe it to them who are in the job market to raise the minimum wage.

This act may be the finest welfare reform bill which we vote on during this session of Congress.

THE PROPOSAL TO LIST THE ARKANSAS RIVER SHINER AS AN ENDANGERED SPECIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. LUCAS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleagues if you are fishing in the Arkansas River Basin, you had better watch what you put on your hook. There is a mighty dangerous little bait fish lurking in the basin's waters when there is water in the basin.

This little bait fish might have the power to stop those in the agriculture industry from irrigating their land, or protecting their crops. This little bait fish might inhibit rural towns from utilizing their primary water sources. This little bait fish might even stop a major metropolitan area from completing its \$250 million downtown restoration project which is crucial to its economic future. Yes my colleagues should know there is a dangerous little bait fish lurking in the river.

The Fish and Wildlife Service is considering whether to put the Arkansas River shiner on the endangered species list. As a new Member of Congress, I am truly underwhelmed by my first dealings with this segment of our Nation's Government. On September 15, 1994, I joined Congressman PAT ROBERTS of Kansas, and Congressman LARRY COMBEST of Texas in sending a letter to Ms. Mollie H. Beattie, the Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, expressing our thoughts on the Arkansas River shiner proposal. To date, neither of my colleagues nor I have received a formal reply.

In our letter, we stated that we were concerned that the listing of the Arkansas River shiner could result in land- and water-use restrictions and other prohibitions that preclude full economic use of property, lower property values, and decimate the economies of the communities in the area. We further urged the Fish and Wildlife Service or an appropriate Government agency to conduct an assessment of the economic impact of any proposal to preserve this little bait fish.

In recent history, western Oklahoma, the Texas Panhandle, and western Kansas were the heart of the legendary Dust Bowl. One generation removed from today's watched as their top soil dried up and blew away. The fact that thriving economies have developed on this once barren land is a testament to the drive and fortitude of the people that live there and their ability to use